

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 10-16 have been amended. Claims 1-17 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-2, 6-8, 10, and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hiraki (U.S. Patent No. 6,424,128). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants note that the rejection of claims 1-2, 6-8, 10, and 14-16 is premised upon Hiraki. Pursuant to MPEP §§ 706.02(a), Hiraki is not a valid 35 U.S.C. §102(b) reference. The July 23, 2002 publication date of Hiraki is not more than one year prior to the effective filing date of the present application, that is, December 13, 2002. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-2, 6-8, 10, and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

It appears that Hiraki may qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Hiraki fails to disclose the inventions of claims 1-2, 6-8, 10, and 14-16.

Claim 1 recites a “driver transistor of said switching regulator is positioned near the first edge and said series regulator is positioned near the second edge, wherein said series regulator and said driver transistor of said switching regulator are separated by a predetermined distance.” Applicants respectfully submit that Hiraki fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 1.

Claim 10 recites a “driver transistor of said switching regulator is positioned near the first edge and said plurality of series regulators are positioned near the second edge.” Applicants respectfully submit that Hiraki fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 10.

Hiraki discloses an integrated chip 110 having a switching regulator 120, a first series regulator 130, and a second series regulator 150. (Hiraki, FIG. 6). Specifically, Hiraki discloses the switching regulator 120 at a first edge of the integrated chip 110 and the second series regulator 150 at a second edge opposite the first edge; and most importantly, the first series regulator 130 is in the middle of the integrated chip 110 situated between the switching regulator 120 and the second series regulator 150. (Hiraki, FIG. 6). Hiraki does not disclose or suggest that the switching regulator 120 is at the first edge and that the second series regulators 150 is at the second edge separated by a predetermined distance, as recited in claim 1. Hiraki also does not disclose or suggest that the switching regulator 120 is at the first edge and that both the first series regulators 130 and the second series regulator 150 are at the second edge, as recited by claim 10. As such, Hiraki fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as recited in claims 1 and 10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection and the allowance of the claims.

Claims 2 and 6-8 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Claims 14-16 depend from claim 10 and are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. As such, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Claims 3 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiraki in view of Maruo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,003,270). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As previously discussed, Hiraki fails to disclose or suggest the inventions of claims 1 and 10. Claim 3 depends from claim 1. Claim 11 depends from claim 10. As such, Hiraki alone can not render claims 3 and 11 unpatentable.

The Office Action relies on Maruko for disclosing the use of a series regulator to supply power to a high-frequency circuit. Maruko fails to disclose or suggest, however, a “driver transistor of said switching regulator is positioned near the first edge and said series regulator is positioned near the second edge, wherein said series regulator and said driver transistor of said switching regulator are separated by a predetermined distance,” as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, Maruko does not disclose or suggest a “driver transistor of said switching regulator is positioned near the first edge and said plurality of series regulators are positioned near the second edge,” as recited in claim 10. As such, Maruko fails to cure the deficiencies of Hiraki. Applicants respectfully submit that Hiraki and Maruko, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the inventions of claims 3 and 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection and the allowance of the claims.

Claims 4-5, 9, 12-13, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiraki. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As previously discussed, Hiraki fails to disclose or suggest the inventions of claims 1 and 10. Claims 4-5 depend from claim 1. Claims 12-13 and 17 depend from claim 10. As such, Hiraki alone can not render claims 4-5, 9, 12-13, and 17 unpatentable. Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 13, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorney for Applicants